REMARKS

I. Status of the Application.

Claims 1 and 3-23 are currently pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Examiner:

(a) alleged that the November 28, 2007 amendment to the specification constituted new matter under 35 U.S.C. §132(a);

(b) alleged that claim 1 and 13, as presently presented, does not comply with the written disclosure requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph;

(c) alleged that claims 1, 3-4, and 13 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,672,674 to Clough ("Clough");

(d) alleged that claims 5, 9, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Clough in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,592 to Vartiainen ("Vartianen");

(e) alleged that claims 6 and 10 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Clough in view of Vartiainen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,538 to Sasaki; and

(f) alleged that claims 1, 3-4, and 13 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,797,852 to Karakasoglu ("Karakasoglu");

(g) determined that claims 7-8, 11-12, 15-16 and 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

While the Applicants agree with Examiner's conclusion that claims 7-8, 11-12, 15-16, and 19-20 contain allowable subject matter, the Applicants traverse the objection to the specification and the rejections of claims 1, 3-5, 9, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 for all the reasons set forth below.

II. The Objections to the Amended Specification Should Be Withdrawn.

In reviewing the Examiner's reasons for continuing the objections to the amendments to the specification, it appears the Examiner is looking for a section of the Application that originally had the exact language that appears in the amendment. The Applicants remind the Examiner that the Applicants are permitted to amend the Application to rephrase the subject matter described in the Application as originally filed. "Mere rephrasing of a passage does not constitute new matter. Accordingly, a rewording of a passage where the same meaning remains intact is permissible." MPEP §2163.07 (8th Ed., Rev. 7) (2008) (emphasis added) (citing *In re Anderson*, 471 F.2d 1237 (CCPA 1973)).

Applicants amended the Application so that the paragraph on page 8, line 20 reads as follows (additions appear in underlined text and deletions appear in strike through text):

> With microphone elements 22 and 24 comprising two omnidirectional elements, signal flow processor 20 further uses a 'balancing' scheme that is known to those skilled in the art. The balancing scheme is run in the idles state to effectively match the electroacoustic sensitivities of the two omnidirectional elements. As a result of this balancing scheme, the two omnidirectional elements produce like input signals for processing in signal flow processor 20. In other words, the elements take on substantially equal complex sensitivities (in amplitude and phase) thus allowing signal flow processor 20 to apply ~~which is essential prior to the application of~~ transfer functions τ and Gm1. This balancing scheme utilizes, in the idle state, the ever present, far field diffuse room

noise as its acoustic input and employs a long averaging time. This balancing is constantly updated in the idle state, but should not change substantially over years of service.

Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments: "As a result of this balancing scheme, the two omnidirectional elements produce like input signals for processing in signal flow processor 20~~, which is essential prior to the application~~. In other words, the elements take on substantially equal complex sensitivities (in amplitude and phase) thus allowing signal flow processor 20 to apply transfer functions τ and Gm1" are supported by the Application. For example on page 8, lines 21-23, the original Application specifically discusses that "the balance scheme is run in the idle state to effectively *match the electro acoustic sensitivities* of the two omnidirectional elements." Also in line 23 on page 8 and lines 1-2 on page 9, the original Application states: "As a result of this balancing scheme, the two omnidirectional elements produce *like input signals* for processing signal flow processor 20, which is essential prior to the application of transfer functions τ and Gm1."

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended phrase "elements take on substantially equal complex sensitivities (in amplitude and phase)" is just rephrasing the original statements that "the balance scheme is run in the idle state to effectively match the electro acoustic sensitivities of the two omnidirectional elements" and "As a result of this balancing scheme, the two omnidirectional elements produce like input signals." Moreover, the further statement "thus allowing signal flow processor 20 to apply transfer functions τ and Gm1" is again merely rephrasing the original statement that "As a result of this balancing scheme, the two omnidirectional elements produce like input signals for processing signal flow processor 20,

which is essential prior to the application of transfer functions τ and Gm1." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment adds nothing new because it merely rephrases what was originally disclosed.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the proposed amendments: "This balancing scheme utilizes, in the idle state, the ever present, far field diffuse room noise as its acoustic input and employs a long average time" are supported by the original Application. The originally filed Application specifically states that "the balancing scheme is run in the *idle state*." (p. 8, lines 21-22). Thus, Applicants have added nothing new by the amendment: "This balancing scheme utilizes, in the idle state", because the Application originally stated that the balancing scheme occurs in the idles state. Thus, anything the balancing scheme utilizes will also be utilized in the idle state.

The originally filed Application also describes in several places that the room noise is in the far field. For example, the paragraph starting on line 13 of page 8 discusses a process for preventing far-end person from hearing noise during the idle state and specifically describes the room noise coming from the far field on lines 15-16 ("because room noise is received by the microphone elements from all angles and from the far-field") and on line 18 of page 8 ("far-field ambient room noise pickup"). Thus, Applicants have added nothing new by the amendment "ever present, far field diffuse room noise", because the originally filed Application specifically states that the room noise comes from the far field.

For all the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the November 28, 2007 amendments to the Application do not constitute new matter and are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's

objection to the amendments to the Application as being new matter under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) should be withdrawn and the amendments should be entered as previously presented in Applicants' November 28, 2007 paper.

III. The Rejections Of Claims 1 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph Should Be Withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn because the specification supports all the subject matter of previously presented claims 1 and 13. In reviewing the Examiner's reasons for continuing the rejections of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, it appears the Examiner is looking for a section of the Application that originally had the exact language that mirrors the objected to language in claims 1 and 13. The Applicants remind the Examiner that the subject matter of claims 1 and 13 need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement. MPEP §§ 2163.02 & 2164 (citing, *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 262, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976)). As stated in 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, "The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains . . . to make and use the same."

Applicants respectfully submit that the originally filed Application contains a description that enables any person skilled in the art to make and use the microphone system of claim 1 and the method of producing a null in claim 13. In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that the specification does not clearly disclose how the processing of such second microphone's output "undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation

which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently at the second microphone element" is performed. (Office Action, pp. 3-4) Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

As discussed in Applicants' previous response, the Applicants specifically describe how the gain (Gm1) is calculated and applied. The Application states "when phone 30 is in either the receive state or in the double talk state, signal flow processor 20 utilizes the digital signal processor to provide an advantageous electrical time delay (τ) to microphone element 22 and a compatible and advantageous amplitude gain (Gm1) to microphone element 24." (p. 7, lines 14-17). Moreover, the Application describes exemplary processes to one of ordinary skill in the art on how to calculate such amplitude gain that needs to be applied. (pp. 10-11). For example, the Application provides equations as to how one of ordinary skill in the art can calculate such amplitude gain and the Application also describes how to calculate the amplitude gain by driving the receiver with an electrical impulse. (p. 10, lines 7-23; p. 11, lines 6-13). Further, the Application walks through a simulated performance analysis for the microphone system and how the amplitude gain is calculated. (pp. 11-13, Figs. 2-3).

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the originally filed Application provides the necessary information for one of ordinary skill in the art to calculate the gain in more than one way and one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to use the signal flow processor to apply such gain to the second microphone. By calculating and applying the gain in this manner, one skilled in the art would ensure that "the second microphone's output undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and

subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. Thus, by describing how to apply and calculate the gain, the Application meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, in that it has provided a description of the invention that enables any person skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

IV. The Rejections Of Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 17-18, And 21-23 As Being Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Should Be Withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 17-18, and 21-23 should be withdrawn because the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims and thus, the combination of the prior art would not achieve the claimed invention. The Examiner supported the obviousness allegations based on the belief that the cited prior art teaches all the elements of the claims. (Office Action, pp. 4-14). To support a conclusion of obviousness based on this rationale, the Examiner must establish that "a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the prior art to achieve the claimed invention and that there would have been a reasonable expectation of success." *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.,* 464 F.3d 1356, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *See also*, MPEP §2143 (G) (8th Ed., Rev. 7) (2008).

A. The Claimed Invention.

As discussed in the Application, a need exists for a microphone system for communication devices that reduces the amount of external acoustic coupling of any type of communication device. (p. 1, ll. 15-24; p. 2, ll. 1-7; p. 3, ll. 7-8). The microphone system and

method of claims 1 and 13 aim to satisfy such a need by creating "a null that reduces external acoustic coupling." As described in the Application, the null is a "dead spot/dead region with respect to audio waves received at a certain angle from the receiver of the communication device." (p. 8, ll. 1-12). As claimed in claims 1 and 13, such a null is created by having a signal flow processor apply an electrical time delay only to the first microphone element, apply a compatible amplitude gain only to the second microphone element, and subtract the output of the first and second microphone elements. The delay is such that the output of the first microphone element undergoes a phase change substantially equal to that which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element. Further, the compatible amplitude gain is such that the output of the second microphone undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element.

B. Clough Fails to Disclose, Teach or Suggest All the Limitations of the Claimed Invention.

As discussed in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13 are not obvious over Clough because Clough does not disclose, teach or suggest the creation of "a null that reduces external acoustic coupling". Nor does Clough disclose, teach or suggest the application of an electronic delay or an compatible amplitude gain that is calculated based on the coupling acoustical traveling wave.

Clough discloses, teaches and suggests a microphone system that produces an output signal having an improved speech to noise ratio which can be used in the presence of loud acoustic noise. (Col. 1, ll. 5-10; Col. 2, ll. 11-21). In Clough, the microphone system comprises at least two noise cancelling microphones and positions one of the microphones in a position to receive speech (the "first Clough microphone") and the other microphone in a position to receive little to no speech (the "second Clough microphone"). (Col 2, ll. 11-21). Clough filters the output of each of the microphones through a band filter to remove the frequencies that fall outside the frequencies of speech. (Col. 1, ll. 43-52; Col. 3, ll. 8-25). After being filtered, an equal number of samples are collected from each microphone at pre-determined frequencies and each sample from the second Clough microphone is multiplied by weighting factors, summed, inverted and then subtracted from the corresponding sample from the first Clough microphone to produce an output signal (Col. 1, ll. 43-52; Col. 3, ll. 14-46). Clough discloses that such microphone systems can be improved by positioning these microphones closer together, sampling the signals at constant intervals of time and processing samples in batches of $N=2^n$. (Col. 4, ll. 5-32). In this manner, Clough is able to utilize the samples taken from the second Clough microphone to reduce the background noise and produce an output signal with an improved speech to noise ratio.

While Clough reduces background/ambient noise, Applicants respectfully submit that Clough fails to disclose, teach or suggest a microphone system or a method that creates "a null that reduces external acoustic coupling", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. As discussed in this response, the Applicants define the term "null" to mean a "dead spot/dead region with respect to audio waves received at a certain angle from the receiver of the communication device." Clough

does not discuss such a dead spot/dead region relative to the receiver of a communication device and only discloses, teaches and suggest a microphone system and method that reduces the ambient/background noise generally through the filtering, sampling, and subtraction of output signals received from two or more microphones. In fact, Clough does not discuss or reference the receiver of the communication device or utilizing a null to reduce acoustic coupling at all.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Clough discloses, teaches or suggests applying an electrical time delay only to the first microphone element "such that the first . . . output undergoes a phase change substantially equal to that which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element" and applying a compatible amplitude gain only to the second microphone element "such that the second . . . output undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

While Clough discusses utilizing a delay circuit 10 for delaying the signal from the first Clough microphone, Clough does not disclose, teach or suggest that such delay should be computed so that that output of the first microphone "undergoes a phase change substantially equal to that which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. In fact, Clough does not discuss or reference the problem of acoustic coupling or disclose, teach or suggest applying a time delay to the first

microphone that is calculated based on the phase change a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the first and second microphone.

Similarly, while Clough discusses utilizing a weighing circuit 11 to multiply the samples from the second Clough microphone by a multiplying factor, Clough does not disclose, teach or suggest that an amplitude gain should be applied to the output of the second microphone "such that the second . . . output undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. Clough does not discuss or reference the problem of acoustic coupling or disclose, teach or suggest applying an amplitude gain that is calculated based on the amplitude attenuation which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the first and second microphone.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claim 1 and 13 as being obvious over Clough should be withdrawn. Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should also be withdrawn because each of these claims depend from and incorporate all the limitations of independent claim 1. MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious)).

C. The Rejections of Claim 5, 9, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Obvious Over Clough In View Of Vartiainen And Claims 6 And 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Obvious Over Clough In View Of Vartiainen And Further In View Of Sasaki Should Be Withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5, 9, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clough in view of Vartiainen and claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clough in view of Vartiainen and further in view of Sasaki are all now moot and should be withdrawn because each of these claims depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of either independent claims 1 or 13, which as discussed above, are not obvious over the cited art. "If an independent claim is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is not obvious." MPEP § 2143.03 (citing *In re Fine,* 837 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 5, 9, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

D. Karakasoglu Fails to Disclose, Teach or Suggest All the Limitations of the Claimed Invention.

As discussed in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13 are not obvious over Karakasoglu because Karakasoglu does not disclose, teach or suggest the creation of "a null that reduces external acoustic coupling". Nor does Karakasoglu disclose, teach or suggest the application of an electronic time delay or an compatible amplitude gain that is defined relative to the coupling acoustical traveling wave. Finally, Karakasoglu also does not disclose, teach or suggest applying an electrical time delay only to the first microphone.

Karakasoglu discloses, teaches and suggest a microphone system for a sleep apnea screening device that utilizes a microphone 37 positioned in the vicinity of the patient's nose and mouth (the "first Karakasoglu microphone") and another microphone 56 positioned to pick up

ambient noise around the patient (the "second Karakasoglu microphone"). (Col. 2, ll. 60-67; Col. 3, ll. 1-5). The microphones are connected to an active noise controller 81 that applies a delay 84 to the digital signal of first Karakasoglu microphone 37 (Col. 4, ll. 7-22). The ambient nose signal from the second Karakasoglu microphone 56 passes through filter units 106 to provide a tapped delayed version of such signal. (Col. 4, ll. 50-66). A weighting unit 111 is connected to the output of each filter 106 so that the delayed sequential output signal is weighted to model the acoustic differences between the two acoustical signals picked up by the first Karakasoglu microphone 37 and the second Karakasoglu microphone 56. (Col. 5, ll. 4-14). The signals from the microphone are then provided to summer 83 to create the output signal 86. In this manner, "it is possible to clean up the breathing signal which is received from the microphone 37 to subtract out room noise and other ambient noise to provide a clean signal that provides the information which can be utilized for screening and/or detection." (Col. 6, ll. 3-8).

Thus, just like Clough, while Karakasoglu discloses a microphone system that cancels out background/ambient noise, Applicants respectfully submit that Karakasoglu fails to disclose, teach or suggest a microphone system or a method that creates "a null that reduces external acoustic coupling", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. As discussed in this response, the Applicants define the term "null" to mean a "dead spot/dead region with respect to audio waves received at a certain angle from the receiver of the communication device." Karakasoglu discloses a sleep apnea detection apparatus that has no receiver. As such, Karakasoglu does not discuss creating such a dead spot/dead region relative to a receiver of a communication device because Karakasoglu has no need to address the problem of acoustic coupling. Rather, the Karakasoglu system only discloses, teaches and suggest a microphone system and method that reduces the

ambient/background noise in order to allow the Karakasoglu system to capture the sounds of the sleeping individual being monitored.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Karakasoglu discloses, teaches or suggests applying an electrical time delay only to the first microphone element "such that the first . . . output undergoes a phase change substantially equal to that which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element" and applying a compatible amplitude gain only to the second microphone element "such that the second . . . output undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

While Karakasoglu discusses utilizing a delay network 84 for delaying the signal from the first Karakasoglu microphone 37 to allow for the system to work in a real time environment (Col. 5, ll. 36-41), Karakasoglu does not disclose, teach or suggest that such delay should be computed so that that output of the first microphone "undergoes a phase change substantially equal to that which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. In fact, Karakasoglu's is not part of a communication device. Thus, Karakasoglu cannot apply a time delay to the first microphone that is calculated based on the phase change a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the first and second microphone, because there is no coupling acoustical traveling waves in Karakasoglu.

Rather, as previously discussed, Karakasoglu applies the time delay to allow for the system to work in a real time environment (Col. 5, ll. 36-41).

It should also be noted that Karakasoglu discloses not only applying a delay to the first Karakasoglu microphone but also discloses applying a delay to the ambient noise signal from the second Karakasoglu microphone. (Col. 4, ll. 55-67; Col. 5, ll. 1-15 and 64-67; Col. 6, ll. 1-2). As claimed in claims 1 and 13, "the signal flow processor provides an electrical time delay only to the first microphone element." Thus, Karakasoglu does not disclose, teach or suggest only applying an electrical time delay to the first microphone.

Similarly, while Karakasoglu discusses utilizing a weighing units 111 to weigh the delayed signals provided by each delay unit 106, Karakasoglu does not, teach or suggest that an amplitude gain should be applied to the output of the second microphone "such that the second . . . output undergoes an amplitude gain substantially equal in magnitude to the amplitude attenuation which the wave undergoes between the time the wave arrives at the first microphone element and subsequently arrives at the second microphone element", as claimed in claims 1 and 13. Again, Karakasoglu does not discuss or reference the problem of acoustic coupling or disclose, teach or suggest applying an amplitude gain that is calculated based on the amplitude attenuation which a coupling acoustical traveling wave undergoes between the first and second microphone, because there is no coupling acoustical traveling waves in Karakasoglu..

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claim 1 and 13 as being obvious over Karakasoglu should be withdrawn. Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should also be withdrawn because each of these claims depend from and incorporate all the limitations of

independent claim 1. MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious)).

E. Conclusion Of Non-Obviousness.

For all the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 17-18, And 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should all be withdrawn and the pending claims should proceed to allowance, because each of these claims are not obvious in view of the cited prior art.

V. Allowable Subject Matter.

While the Applicants agree with the Examiner's conclusion that claims 7-8, 11-12, 15-16, and 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13, as previously presented, are currently in allowable form. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that it is not necessary for the Applicants to rewrite any of these claims in independent form in view of each of these claims depending from either allowable base claims 1 or 13.

VI. Applicants Petition for an Extension of Time.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time of three (3) months, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), thereby extending the deadline for response, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.7(a) & 1.136(a), to Tuesday, May 26, 2009. Applicants authorize payment for this extension in the amount of $555.00 to be charged to the identified credit card. When doing so, please reference the above-listed docket number for this file.

VII. Interview Request.

If the Examiner determines that there are any further objections or rejections that would prevent this Application from proceeding to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to arrange an interview with the undersigned to discuss such objections or rejections.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, allowance of this Application is respectfully requested. Aside from those specified herein, Applicants believe no additional fees are due at this time. In the event Applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for payment of any fees, Applicants conditionally petition therefore, and authorize any deficiency to be charged to deposit account 09-0007. When doing so, please reference the above-listed docket number.

Respectfully submitted,

ICE MILLER LLP

Alexander D. Forman
Attorney No. 51,691
ICE MILLER LLP
One American Square, Suite 2900
Indianapolis, IN 46282-0200
Telephone: (317) 236-5826
Facsimile: (317) 592-5433

Date: May 26, 2009